

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
for the**FILED**

JUN 28 2021

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY

DEPUTY CLERK

2:21-CV-1143

GGH HC

Case No.

(Supplied by Clerk of Court)

Mr. Maurice Miles, SR.  
Petitionerv. "THE Bid Bond 5-14"  
and People of the State of  
CALIFORNIA, and Sheriff  
SCOTT JONES - (SACRA)  
Respondent

(name of warden or authorized person having custody of petitioner)

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241

## Personal Information

- (a) Your full name: MR. MAURICE D. MILES, SR.  
(b) Other names you have used: THE POET DEON
- Place of confinement:  
(a) Name of institution: SACRAMENTO SHERIFF COUNTY JAIL  
(b) Address: 651 T STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
(c) Your identification number: (560593714) / CUSIP & AUTOTRIS RULE 8 FRCP...
- Are you currently being held on orders by:  
☐ Federal authorities ☐ State authorities ☒ Other - explain: MALEDICIOUS  
FRAUD AUTHORITIES
- Are you currently:  
☒ A pretrial detainee (waiting for trial on criminal charges)  
☒ Serving a sentence (incarceration, parole, probation, etc.) after having been convicted of a crime  
If you are currently serving a sentence, provide:  
(a) Name and location of court that sentenced you: LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT  
DEPARTMENT 101... RONALD S. COEN / Judge  
(b) Docket number of criminal case: BA385119-01 / (CV13-3475) (CV-14-1063) (DDPLAS)  
(c) Date of sentencing: 6-27-2012

☐ Being held on an immigration charge☒ Other (explain): I WAS ILLEGALLY KIDNAPPED AND HELD HOSTAGE AT THIS JAIL SINCE OCTOBER  
24<sup>TH</sup> 2016 ON FABRICATED, FALSE, TRUMPED UP CHARGES FROM NEW FELSON STATE PRISON.  
WHERE I WAS BRUTALLY ATTACKED BY CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS ON MAY 1<sup>TH</sup> 2010. FOR  
ATTACKING MY "ORIGINAL CONVICTION APPEAL" AND FOR FALSE IMPRISONMENT  
APPEAL...

## Decision or Action You Are Challenging

- What are you challenging in this petition: MY CUSTODY IS ILLEGAL / MALEDICIOUS PROSECUTION, FRAUD.  
☒ How your sentence is being carried out, calculated, or credited by prison or parole authorities (for example, revocation or calculation of good time credits) MY LIBERTY, INTEREST AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS  
HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY SABOTAGED BY STATE GOVERNMENT AND CDCR PENAL  
STATUTE OBLIGATION AGENTS... SPECIES...

- ☐ Pretrial detention
- ☐ Immigration detention
- ☐ Detainer
- ☐ The validity of your conviction or sentence as imposed (for example, sentence beyond the statutory maximum or improperly calculated under the sentencing guidelines)
- ☐ Disciplinary proceedings
- ☒ Other (explain): PETITIONER IS IN IMMEDIATE DANGER AND IS BEING TARGETED, TORMENTED, ABUSED BY KLU KLUX KLAN; WHILE SUPREMACIST GOVERNMENT CORRUPTED OFFICIALS AND THEIR ALLIES... NIGGERS.

6. Provide more information about the decision or action you are challenging: THE BID BOND, PERFORMANCE BOND, AND PAYMENT BOND BELONG TO ME THE PRINCIPAL CREDITOR...
- (a) Name and location of the agency or court: L.A. SUPERIOR COURT; (UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL) (SACRAMENTO SUPERIOR COURT) (UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT EASTERN)
- (b) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: (BA385119-01) (CV13-3428) (CV14-1063) (16FED18415) (CV-01881) (2:21-CV-00989)
- (c) Decision or action you are challenging (for disciplinary proceedings, specify the penalties imposed): CONVICTION FOR MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD (42 USC § 1986) 28 USC § 1338(b), ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978 (28 USC § 49, 591-599), 28 USC § 1343(3), SEC. 702(1) OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, CAL. CON. CODE § 6105, CAL. CON. CODE § 102(1) (1964)...
- (d) Date of the decision or action: 6-27-2012

### Your Earlier Challenges of the Decision or Action

#### 7. First appeal

Did you appeal the decision, file a grievance, or seek an administrative remedy?

☒ Yes ☐ No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

(L.A. SUPERIOR COURT) (U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL) (SACRAMENTO SUPERIOR COURT) (U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN)

(2) Date of filing: 2012

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: (CV13-3428) (CV14-1063) (BA385119-01)

(4) Result: BRUTALLY ATTACKED BY CDCK COP, PROPERTY LOST AND DESTROYED, AND SENT TO UC DAVIS HOSPITAL WITH SERIOUS INJURIES... MAY 17TH 2006

(5) Date of result: THE COURTS ARE NOT LISTENING TO MY CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS AS IF THEY ARE AWARE OF THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST ME BY GOVERNMENT Goblins...

(6) Issues raised: MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD...

PETITIONER WAS FOUND "NOT GUILTY" AT TRIAL FOR CHARGES AND FOR COUNTS (1) 245(D)(1) PC COUNT (2) 245(D)(1) PC, COUNT (3) 459 PC, COUNT (4) 245(D)(1) PC, AND COUNT (5) 664-422 PC "NOT GUILTY" BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA... THIS WAS A VINDICTIVE SHOOTING CASE WHERE L.A.P.D. FIRED THEIR GUN GLOCK'S AT PETITIONER AND OTHER INNOCENT CIVILIANS INSIDE THEIR HOME... ON FALSE PRETEXT THAT PETITIONER POINTED A GUN AT THE OFFICER'S COUNTS (1) 245(D)(1) PC AND COUNT (2) 245(D)(1) PC... NOT GUILTY... THE DA ANNOUNCED IN THE "RECORD" THE TRANSCRIPTS THAT IT WAS HIS POSITION TO INFORM THE COURT THAT IT WAS "NOT" TECHNICALLY 1101(G) INSTRUCTION OF THE EVIDENCE CODE CALIF. RULE 2.50 THAT WAS GIVEN TO THE JURY TO FIND PETITIONER GUILTY OF COUNT (6) 12021(A)(1)... THE DA FAILED TO PROVE HIS CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT... FORCED PETITIONER TO GO TO PRISON TO BE INTENTIONALLY TARGETED, TORMENTED & BRUTALLY ATTACKED ETC...

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not appeal:

#### 8. Second appeal

After the first appeal, did you file a second appeal to a higher authority, agency, or court?

☒ Yes ☐ No

AO 242 (Rev. 09/17) Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

United States District Court Central  
Fraud Judges: 30-11 Pregerson and  
Alka Sugars...

(2) Date of filing:

I believe around 2013

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number:

(CV13-3428) (CV14-1063)

(4) Result:

The judges and court escaped with my bid bond... they have  
not given me the proceeds of my bond, the fixtures, product and proceeds...

(5) Date of result:

N/A

(6) Issues raised:

My custody is illegal... The state California  
Superior Court's government is in commercial dishonor; default judgment...  
I accepted their fabricated, false trumped up charges for value  
and consideration in return for full settlement and closure of  
case and account... My SUCIP and AUTRAIS# is 560593714  
I'm innocent of all state penal statute government false charges to  
sabotage my liberty, interest, and constitutional rights...

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not file a second appeal:

9. **Third appeal**

After the second appeal, did you file a third appeal to a higher authority, agency, or court?

☐ Yes☒ No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

(2) Date of filing:

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number:

(4) Result:

(5) Date of result:

(6) Issues raised:

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not file a third appeal:

(42 USC § 1986)  
(28 USC § 1915(g)) (28 U.S.C. 1338(b))...

10. **Motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255**

In this petition, are you challenging the validity of your conviction or sentence as imposed?

☐ Yes☒ No

If "Yes," answer the following:

(a) Have you already filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 that challenged this conviction or sentence?

☐ Yes☐ No



If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of court: \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Case number: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Date of filing: \_\_\_\_\_

(4) Result: \_\_\_\_\_

(5) Date of result: \_\_\_\_\_

(6) Issues raised: \_\_\_\_\_

- (b) Have you ever filed a motion in a United States Court of Appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A), seeking permission to file a second or successive Section 2255 motion to challenge this conviction or sentence?

☐ Yes☒ No *I'm not familiar with those number's, letter's...*

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of court: \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Case number: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Date of filing: \_\_\_\_\_

(4) Result: \_\_\_\_\_

(5) Date of result: \_\_\_\_\_

(6) Issues raised: \_\_\_\_\_

- (c) Explain why the remedy under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective to challenge your conviction or sentence:

*THE EQUAL PROTECTION clause is violated if a criminal prosecution is deliberately based upon an unjustifiable standard such as race, religion, or other arbitrary classification. THE EQUAL PROTECTION clauses of the federal and state constitutions safeguard individuals from intentional and purposeful invidious discrimination in the enforcement of all laws, including penal statute, etc...*

*A STATE ACTS BY ITS LEGISLATIVE, ITS EXECUTIVE, OR ITS JUDICIAL AUTHORITIES. IT CANNOT ACT IN NO OTHER WAY... THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION OF U.S. CONST. AMEND. XIV, THEREFORE, MUST MEAN THAT AN AGENCY OF THE STATE, OR OF THE OFFICERS OR AGENTS BY WHOM ITS POWERS ARE EXERCISED, SHALL DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS*

## 11. Appeals of immigration proceedings

Does this case concern immigration proceedings?

☐ Yes☒ No

If "Yes," provide:

(a) Date you were taken into immigration custody: \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Date of the removal or reinstatement order: \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Did you file an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals?

☐ Yes☐ No

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Date of filing: \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Case number: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Result: \_\_\_\_\_

(4) Date of result: \_\_\_\_\_

(5) Issues raised: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(d) Did you appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of court: \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Date of filing: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Case number: \_\_\_\_\_

(4) Result: \_\_\_\_\_

(5) Date of result: \_\_\_\_\_

(6) Issues raised: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. **Other appeals**

Other than the appeals you listed above, have you filed any other petition, application, or motion about the issues raised in this petition?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "Yes," provide:

(a) Kind of petition, motion, or application: \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Name of the authority, agency, or court: \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Date of filing: \_\_\_\_\_

(d) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: \_\_\_\_\_

(e) Result: \_\_\_\_\_

(f) Date of result: \_\_\_\_\_

(g) Issues raised: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Grounds for Your Challenge in This Petition

13. State every ground (reason) that supports your claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. Any legal arguments must be submitted in a separate memorandum.

**GROUND ONE:** *PETITIONER CUSTODY IS ILLEGAL... MALICIOUS PROSECUTION; DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD. STATE GOVERNMENT COVER UP OF L.A.P.D. DELIBERATE FORCE ACTION ON JUNE 1, 2011 CASE# 12A85119-01 LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT... THE LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY FAILED TO PROVE HIS CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT... THE JURY DELIBERATION VERDICT WAS "NOT GUILTY" OF CHARGES AND/OR COUNTS (1) 245(D)(1) PC; COUNT (2) 245(D)(1); COUNT(3) 459; COUNT(4) 245(A)(2); AND COUNT(5) 604-422 "NOT GUILTY"*

(a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.):

*THE JURY DELIBERATION'S VERDICT WAS "NOT GUILTY" OF COUNTS (1) AND (2) 245(D)(1) TO SHOW SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF PREVARICATION- UNLAWFUL SHOOTING OF A VALID CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM TO APPEAL COUNT (6) AND OVERTURN AND RETURN BACK TO THE DISTRICT COURT FOR TIME DIMINISH REDUCTION OF A 10 YEAR SENTENCE OF MALICIOUS PROSECUTION DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD... IN THE TRANSCRIPT RECORDED THE D.A. MADE AN UNDISCLOSED STATEMENT: AN EXAMPLE AN ANALOGY... THAT IT WAS HIS POSITION TO INFORM THE COURT THAT IT WAS "NOT" TECHNICALLY (110)(B) INSUFFICIENT OF THE EVIDENCE CODE CALIF. NUMBER 2.50 THAT WAS GIVEN TO THE JURY TO FIND PETITIONER GUILTY OF COUNT(6) 12071(A)(1)...*

(b) Did you present Ground One in all appeals that were available to you?

☒ Yes

☐ No

**GROUND TWO:** *WHAT GOES ON IN THE COURT ROOMS GO BACK TO EDWARD THE FIRST- IT'S CALLED "STATUTE MERCHANT" AND WHAT IT IS, IS A BOND OF MERCHANT OR BOND OF RECORD. THE STATUTES THEMSELVES ARE THE BOND AND WHAT THEY DO IS DUPLICATE TO "STATUTES" THAT THEY CHARGE YOU UNDER WITH WHAT THEY CALL A "RECOGNIZANCE BOND" AND PEOPLE SIGN THE "RECOGNIZANCE BOND" WITHOUT READING WHAT THE BOND SAYS... AND WHAT IT SAYS IS, IS THAT YOU AGREE TO PAY BACK THE DEBT. THIS IS CIVIL NOT CRIMINAL...*

(a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.): *THERE'S A BOOK OUT CALLED: JURISDICTION AND*

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§ 1338(b)*

(b) Did you present Ground Two in all appeals that were available to you?

☒ Yes

☐ No

*"NOT ALL"*

**GROUND THREE:** *WHAT'S GOING ON IN THE COURTROOM IS THAT THEY ARE Suing YOU FOR A DEBT COLLECTION... WHAT IT IS, IS AN ACTION OF "ASSUMPSIT" THE WORD "PRESUMIE" COME FROM THE WORD "ASSUMPSIT" WHICH MEANS "I AGREE OR I PRESUME TO DO"... AN ACT OF ASSUMPSIT" WHICH MEANS "I AGREE TO A COLLECTION OF A DEBT" IF YOU LOOK AT THESE BOND: BID BOND, PERFORMANCE BOND & PAYMENT BOND ALL HAVE A PENAL SUM ATTACHED TO IT... THE REASON FOR THE "PENAL SUM" IS IF YOU DON'T PAY THE DEBT, YOU GO INTO "DEFAULT JUDGMENT"... THAT IS WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE COURT ROOM...*

(a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.):

*THIS IS WHAT THEY USED TO DO BACK IN EDWARD THE 1ST DAYS, IF YOU OWED A DEBT THEY WOULD SEND A SHERIFF OUT WITH A WARRANT TO ARREST YOU... THIS IS ALL CIVIL, THIS IS NOT CRIMINAL... IT JUST A SMOKE SCREEN TO COVER UP WHAT THEY ARE DOING WITH MERCANTILE CIVIL LAW AND WHAT THEY USED TO DO WHEN THEY ARREST PEOPLE WITH A WARRANT AND BROUGHT THE PERSON INTO COURT AND MADE THEM SIGN A BOND TO RELEASE UNTIL THE CIVIL SUIT COMPLETED... IT ACTUALLY SAYS "CIVIL SUIT" IN CLERK'S PRACTICE...*

(b) Did you present Ground Three in all appeals that were available to you?

☒ Yes

☐ No

*"NOT ALL"*



**GROUND FOUR:**

HERE'S WHAT GOES ON: A CONTRACTOR COME IN OR ANY CORPORATION, could come in and what they do is tender a bid bond to the U.S. DISTRICT COURT and they buy up these state court judgments and anytime you issue a bid bond these has to be a REINSURANCE. THEY EVEN HAVE A REINSURANCE TREATY... INTERNATIONAL TREATIES... IF YOU READ THE CONSTITUTION, TREATIES ARE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND...

(a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.):

SO THEY GET A "REINSURANCE COMPANY" TO COME IN AND ACT AS "SURETY" FOR THE BID BOND THEN THEY BRING IN A PERFORMANCE BOND... ALL OF THESE BONDS: BID, PAYMENT & PERFORMANCE ARE "SURETY BONDS" and anytime you issue a Bid Bond it has to have a "SURETY". WHERE IS THE SURETY GOING? IT GUARANTEEING OR REINSURING THE BID BOND BY ISSUING A PERFORMANCE BOND. THAT'S WHAT THESE PERFORMANCE BOND ARE. THEN THEY GET AN UNDERWRITER AND THAT WOULD BE EITHER AN INVESTMENT BROKER OR AN INVESTMENT BANKER. THEY COME IN AND UNDERWRITE THE PERFORMANCE BOND WHICH IS REINSURING THE BID BOND. WHAT DOES THE UNDERWRITER DO WITH THE PAYMENT BOND. THE UNDERWRITER TAKE THE 3 BOND AND POOL THEM AND KNOW AS "MORTGAGED BACK SECURITIES" AND WHEN YOU POOL THESE MBS THEIR CALLED "BONDS" AND THEIR SOLD TO A COMPANY CALLED TBA WHICH IS THE "BOND MARKET ASSOCIATION". THIS IS AN ACTUAL CORPORATION

(b) Did you present Ground Four in all appeals that were available to you?

☐ Yes ☐ No

"NOT ALL"

14. If there are any grounds that you did not present in all appeals that were available to you, explain why you did not:

PETITIONER WAS INTENTIONALLY TARGETED, TORMENTED, BRUALLY ATTACKED. AND FALSILY CHARGED AGAIN. AND KIDNAPPED AND HELD HOSTAGE IN THIS SHERIFF JAIL SINCE OCTOBER 24TH 2016... AND THE CORRECTIONAL COP THAT GOT ME SITTING IN THIS JAIL HAS BEEN ISSUED FROM NEW FULSON STATE PRISON DO TO AN INVESTIGATION OF CORRUPTION ETC... OFFICER DANIEL GARLAND" SEE SACRAMENTO BEE NEWS PAPER'S DATED (4-18-2021) (4-26-2021) (4-30-2021) (5-1-2021)... NEW FULSON STATE PRISON CORRECTIONAL COPS CORRUPTION... INVESTIGATION...

### Request for Relief

15. State exactly what you want the court to do: GET ME IMMEDIATELY RELEASED FROM CUSTODY; THEY HAVE NOT CLOSED MY ACCOUNT... THEY HAVE NOT GIVEN ME THE PROCEEDS OR MY "BOND"; THE FIXTURES, "PRODUCTS" & PROCEEDS... PURSUANT TO IMMIGRADA IN ACTUALLY UNDER RULE 9.8... I WANT THE BOND BACK AND TO BE RELEASED FROM CUSTODY... I WANT FULL SETTLEMENT AND CLOSURE AND RELEASE THE BOND... MY LAST 4 CUSIP AND AUTOTRIS NUMBERS ARE (3714)

CUSIP MEANS:

"Committee on Uniform Securities Identification Processes"...

AUTOTRIS MEANS:

"Automated Tracking Identification Systems"...

THIS NUMBER, THEY PUT IT IN A NUMBER... ITS IN A MODULE AND EVERY FEDERAL AGENCY AND EVERY STATE AGENCY HAS MY TRACKING NUMBER... THEY HAVE IT IN THE CRIMINAL TASK FORCE THAT USES IT AND SO DO ALL OF THE COURTS AND ALL OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENTS THE CITY, COUNTY SHERIFF, FEMA, HOMELAND SECURITY... ETC...

**Declaration Under Penalty Of Perjury**

If you are incarcerated, on what date did you place this petition in the prison mail system:

6-20-2021

I declare under penalty of perjury that I am the petitioner, I have read this petition or had it read to me, and the information in this petition is true and correct. I understand that a false statement of a material fact may serve as the basis for prosecution for perjury. ALSO SEE: "ERIE V. TOMPKINS" 82 LED 1188, 304 US 64 (4-25-1938)  
 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE V. REPORTERS COMMITTEE 109 SCT 1468  
 103 LED 2d 714, 489 US 749 (3-22-1989)  
 TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY V. ANGLO SCANDINAVIAN CORPORATION  
 298 F. SUPP 210, 1969 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 9509, 4 U.C.C. REP. SERV.  
 3-12-1969... CIV. NO. 5-781...

Date: 6-20-2021

Mini Mini; Y.M. The Poet  
 Signature of Petitioner

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature of Attorney or other authorized person, if any

Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C.A. 1338(b)

ALSO SEE:  
 NICHOLAS MONASTRA V. KONICA BUSINESS MACHINES, U.S.A., INC  
 et al., 43 CAL. APP. 4TH 1028, 51 CAL. RPT. 2d 528 (3-28-1996)  
 DAILY JOURNAL DAK 3612, 29 U.C.C. REP. SERV. 2d  
 NO. B6846TH

IN RE WIMSHIP, 90 SCT 1068, 25 LED 2d 368, 397 US 358  
 (3-31-1970)...  
 MURGIA V. THE MUNICIPAL COURT, 15 CAL. 3d 286, 540  
 P. 2d 44, 124 CAL. RPT. 204. (9-24-1975)...  
 COLE V. ARKANSAS, 92 LED 644, 333 US 196 (2-5-1948)  
 "Cong Globe, 42d Cong. 1st SESS, 789 (1871)"



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

DATE : APRIL 13, 2021 DEPT. NO : 21  
JUDGE : SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG CLERK : E. HIGGINBOTHAM  
REPORTER : NONE BAILIFF : NONE

In re the Matter of

Case No. 21HC00115

MAURICE MILES, SR. *An UNREASONABLE APPLICATION of THE FACTS in LIGHT of THE EVIDENCE... PETITIONER PLEADED "NOT GUILTY". PETITIONER WAS FOUND "NOT GUILTY" AT TRIAL FOR CHARGE AND/OR COUNT(S) (1), (2), (3), (4) AND (5)... THE DELIBERATION VERDICT BY THE JURY... SEE: COLE V. ARKANSAS, 92 LEd 644, 333 US 196 (3-8-1948)...*

On Habeas Corpus.

**Nature of Proceedings: PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - ORDER**

The Court has received and considered the above-entitled petition for writ of habeas corpus. The petition is DENIED. *PETITIONER PLEADED "NOT GUILTY"... DELIBERATION VERDICT BY THE JURY WAS NOT GUILTY OF COUNT(S) (1) 245(b)(1) PC, COUNT (2) 245(b)(1) PC, COUNT (3) 459 PC, COUNT (4) 245(b)(2) PC, AND COUNT (5) 604-422 PC... "NOT GUILTY" OF THESE CHARGES... THE L.A.P.D. FIRED THEIR 9MM GLOCKS AT PETITIONER BASED ON COUNTS (1) 245(b)(1) PC AND (2) 604-422 PC... THE JURY DID NOT JUSTIFY THE OFFICER UNLAWFUL SHOOTING... LIES; STATE GOVERNMENT COVER UP...*

a. Challenge to 2011 Conviction 245(b)(1) PC...

A petition for writ of habeas corpus cannot serve as a second appeal or substitute appeal. (*In re Harris* (1993) 5 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 813, 829.) Claims that could have been raised on appeal are not cognizable on habeas corpus unless the petitioner can show that (1) clear and fundamental constitutional error strikes at the heart of the trial process; (2) the court lacked fundamental jurisdiction; (3) the court acted in excess of jurisdiction not requiring a redetermination of facts; or (4) a change in law after the appeal affected the petitioner. (*In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759; *In re Harris, supra*, at p. 828.)

Here, Petitioner challenges the legality of his 2011 conviction from Los Angeles County case BA385119. Specifically, he claims his conviction was the result of prosecutorial misconduct and the use of false evidence, the trial court erred in imposing enhancements, and the trial constituted double jeopardy. These claims are all based on matters in the record and could have been brought on appeal. Petitioner has not shown that his claims fall into any of the above-stated exceptions. Furthermore, the claim is untimely. A habeas petitioner must "explain and justify any significant delay in seeking relief." (*In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 750, 765, fn. 5.) The length of delay is measured from the time that a petition becomes or should reasonably have become aware of the grounds for relief. (*Ibid.*) Petitioner does not explain the decade long delay in raising this claim. Accordingly, this claim is denied.

*PETITIONER APPEALED SEE CASE# (CV13-2428)  
(CV14-1063)  
(DDP/AS)*

BOOK :  
PAGE :  
DATE : APRIL 13, 2021  
CASE NO. : 21HC00115  
CASE TITLE : IN RE MAURICE MILES, SR.,

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

BY: E. HIGGINBOTHAM  
Deputy Clerk

CASE NUMBER: 21HC00115

DEPARTMENT : 21

CASE TITLE : IN RE MAURICE MILES, SR.

PROCEEDINGS: PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - ORDER

b. Return of "Bid Bond"

To state a prima facie case, a habeas petition must state, with particularity, the facts upon which the petitioner is relying to justify relief, and be supported by reasonably available documentary evidence; vague conclusory allegations are insufficient to warrant issuance of a writ. (*In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 303-304; *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474; *In re Harris* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 813, 827 fn.5.) In addition, the petitioner bears the burden of stating a prima facie case that if true, would entitle him to relief. (*In re Bower* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 865, 872).

Petitioner is currently at the Sacramento County Main Jail awaiting adjudication of criminal charges filed in case 16FE018715. Bail is set in the amount of \$2 million. He requests the return of his "bid bond" standard Form 24." First, the standard Form 24 bid bond referred to in the petition is intended for use by government contractors to ensure financial security in Federal Government contracts. It is not the same as the bail bond ordered in a criminal case. Additionally, while Petitioner provides a lengthy history of the use of bonds and about federal jurisdiction, he provides no legal authority and supporting facts justifying return of any bond nor has he shown that he is paid any bond. Petitioner has failed to state a prima facie case for relief.

I HAVE ALREADY ACCEPTED THE CHARGES FOR "VALUE AND CONSIDERATION" IN RETURN FOR FULL SETTLEMENT AND CLOSURE OF THE ACCOUNT...  
USE MY EXEMPTION AS PRINCIPAL... AND RETURN MY BOND...

SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG

SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

MY LAST 4 CUSIP AND AUTOTRIS NUMBERS ARE (3714)

CUSIP MEANS:

Committee on Uniform Securities "Identification" Processes

AUTOTRIS MEANS:

Automated Tracking "Identification" System

PURSUANT TO RULE 8 FRCP  
"I ACCEPT FOR VALUE"...

BOOK :  
PAGE :  
DATE : APRIL 13, 2021  
CASE NO. : 21HC00115  
CASE TITLE : IN RE MAURICE MILES, SR.

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

BY: E HIGGINBOTHAM  
Deputy Clerk



## SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

## COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

SEE: ROBINSON V. NARUFFI, 895 F.2d 649 (CAL. 1990)  
 STRENGTH V. HUBERT, 854 F.2d 426 AND 425 (CAL. 1988)  
 COOGAN V. WIXEN, 820 F.2d 170, 175 (CAL. 1987)  
 ENTICK V. CARRINGTON, 19 How. ST. TR. 1029 (1765)

DATE : JUNE 16, 2021 DEPT. NO : 21  
 JUDGE : SHELLEYANNE CHANG CLERK : E. HIGGINBOTHAM  
 REPORTER : NONE BAILIFF : NONE

In re *ALSO SEE: OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES' FAMOUS ESSAY: "PRIVILEGE, NOTICE AND INTENT" 8 HARV. L. REV. 1.."*

MAURICE MILES, SR.

Case No. 21HC00115

On Habeas Corpus. *AMERICAN GUILD OF MUSICAL ARTISTS V. PETRILLO, 286 N.Y. 220, 231, 36 N. 2d 123. OPERA ON TOUR, INC. V. WEBER 285 N.Y. 348, 34 N.E. GREEN V. DAVIES. 182 N.Y. 499, 75 N.E. 536*

## Nature of Proceedings: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - ORDER

*AN UNREASONABLE APPLICATION OF THE FACTS IN LIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE*

Petitioner's objection to the Court's order issued April 13, 2021 in the above-referenced case has been received, filed and considered. The Court will construe the objection as a motion for reconsideration. It is HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

*THIS APPLICATION IS FRAUDULENT, DEFIES COMMON SENSE...*

Petitioner is incarcerated at the Sacramento County Main Jail awaiting trial in Sacramento County case number 16FE018715. On March 1, 2021, he filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus under the above-referenced case number challenging his 2011 conviction from Los Angeles County and the bail order set in his current Sacramento County proceedings. This Court denied the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner has now submitted this request to reconsider the denial of his habeas petition.

*PETITIONER WAS FOUND "NOT GUILTY" AT TRIAL FOR CHARGES: (1)(2)(3)(4) AND (5)...*

No appeal lies from an order denying a petition for writ of habeas corpus. [Citations.] (*Jackson v. Superior Court* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1051, 1064.) "An order denying a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the superior court is final immediately upon its filing, and review of the order can only be had by the filing of a new petition in the Court of Appeal." (*Id.* at 1064, fn. 5, quoting *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767, fn. 7.) Thus, there is no express provision for a motion to reconsider.

*PETITIONER PLEADED "NOT GUILTY"... THIS WAS A "OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING" CASE...*

Nevertheless, Petitioner states no meritorious grounds or bases that persuade the Court that its prior order under the petition was incorrect, improper, or otherwise erroneous. (*Jackson, supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th 1051.) Nor does Petitioner present any new facts or claims that would warrant reconsideration. Instead, the motion merely reargues the same facts and arguments raised in the initial petition. *"I'M INNOCENT..."*

DATED: 6/16/2021

false signature

SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG

SIRAH NANI SIGNATURE... (U.C.C 3-419)...

HONORABLE SHELLEYANNE CHANG,  
 JUDGE OF THE SACRAMENTO SUPERIOR COURT  
*"ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT of 1978 (28 USC § 44, 591-599)..."*

BOOK : 21  
 PAGE : 21HC00115  
 DATE : JUNE 9, 2021  
 CASE NO. : 21HC00115  
 CASE TITLE : IN RE: MAURICE MILES, SR.

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

BY: E. HIGGINBOTHAM  
 Deputy Clerk



CASE NUMBER: 21HC00115

DEPARTMENT : 21

CASE TITLE : IN RE: MAURICE MILES, SR.

PROCEEDINGS: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAILING**

(C.C.P. Sec. 1013a(4))

I, the Clerk of the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, certify that I am not a party to this cause, and on the date shown below I served the foregoing **ORDER** by depositing true copies thereof, enclosed in separate, sealed envelopes with the postage fully prepaid, in the United States Mail at Sacramento, California, each of which envelopes was addressed respectively to the persons and addresses shown below:

MAURICE MILES, SR.,  
651 I STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94814

DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
ATTN: JTI UNIT  
\*SENT VIA INTEROFFICE MAIL\*

ROB BONTA  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
P.O. BOX 944255  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244

*An unreasonable application of the facts in light of the "evidence"...*  
28 U.S.C. § 2254 BAKER V. CITY OF PLAINFIELD 4TH CIR. 2000) 245 F.3d 1138  
MOORE V. CALDERON 7TH CIR. 1997) 108 F.3d 261.  
Petitioners "not guilty"; counts (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) THE TRIAL DELIBERATION VERDICTS: "... THE JURY

I, the undersigned deputy clerk, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: June 16, 2021

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

THE REMARKS of MR. CULLEN, id., at 459-460:

By:

STRAW MAN SIGNATURE

E. HIGGINBOTHAM

E. HIGGINBOTHAM, Deputy Clerk

"WHenever, then, there is a denial of equal protection by the state, the courts of justice of the nation stand with open doors, ready to receive and hear with impartial attention the complaints of those who are denied redress elsewhere... HERE MAY COME THE WEAK AND FEARFUL AND HUMILIATED, WITH ASSURANCE THAT THEY SHALL BE HEARD... HERE MAY COME THE MAN SMITTEN WITH MANY STRIPES AND ASK FOR REDRESS... HERE MAY COME THE NATION, IN HER MAJESTY, AND DEMAND THE TRIAL AND PUNISHMENT OF OFFENDERS, WHEN ALL OTHER TRIBUNALS ARE CLOSED..."

"CAN THESE MEANS BE MADE EFFECTUAL? CAN WE THUS SUPPRESS THESE WRONGS? I WILL SAY WE CAN BUT TRY... THE UNITED STATES COURTS ARE FURTHER ABOVE mere local influence than the county courts. THEIR JUDGES CAN ACT WITH MORE INDEPENDENCE, CANNOT BE PUT UNDER TERROR AS LOCAL JUDGES CAN. THEIR SYMPATHIES ARE NOT HEAVILY IDENTIFIED WITH THOSE OF THE VICINAGE. THE JURORS ARE TAKEN FROM THE STATE, AND NOT THE NEIGHBORHOOD; THEY WILL BE ABLE TO RISE ABOVE PREJUDICES OR BAD PASSIONS OR TERROR MORE EASILY... THE "MARSHAL" WITH MORE POWER THAN THE SHERIFF, CAN MAKE ARRESTS WITH CERTAINTY, AND, WITH THE AID OF THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT, CAN SEIZE OFFENDERS IN SPITE OF ANY BARRIERS AND COMBINED RESISTANCE SUCH AS MAY BE EXPECTED... THUS, AT LEAST, THESE MEN, WHO DISREGARD ALL LAW, CAN BE BROUGHT TO TRIAL... HERE WE STOP... THE COURT IS TO DO THE REST, ACTING UNDER AN ITS SPECIAL OBLIGATIONS OF DUTY TO COUNTRY AND GOD... CAN WE TRUST IT, OR ARE WE AFRAID OF OUR OWN INSTITUTIONS? DOES THE GRIM SHADOW OF THE STATE STEP INTO THE NATIONAL COURT, LIKE A "GOBLIN" AND TERRIFY US? DOES THIS ARMILESS AND HELPLESS GHOST DRIVE US FROM THAT TRIBUNAL - THE "STATE" THAT "NICKS" AT JUSTICE, THE STATE THAT "LICENSES" UNLAWFUL "THE STATE THAT STAND DUMB" WHEN THE LASH AND THE TORCH AND THE PISTOL ARE LIFTED EVERY NIGHT OVER THE QUIET CITIZEN? WE BELIEVE THAT WE CAN TRUST OUR UNITED STATES COURTS; AND WE PROPOSE TO DO SO. P." MOORE V. PAPE 365 U.S. AT 733. 1961...

BOOK : 21  
PAGE : 21HC00115  
DATE : JUNE 16, 2021  
CASE NO. : 21HC00115  
CASE TITLE : IN RE: MAURICE MILES, SR.

Superior Court of California, County of  
Sacramento

BY: E. HIGGINBOTHAM  
Deputy Clerk

cc: PRACKETT V. GRISHOLD, 112 NY 434, 406, 26 NE 376...  
 BOB V. HECKSHER 235 APP. DIV. 82.83.256, NY 126  
 KEEBLE V. HICKERINGILL, 11 EAST 574 v....

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

JUN 9 2021

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

S267689

Deputy

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

In re MAURICE MILES, SR., on Habeas Corpus.

*The Pet/Deed*

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely].)

~~XXX~~

~~XXX~~

*Afford a federal right in federal courts because, by reason of prejudice, passion, neglect, intolerance or otherwise, "state laws" might not be enforced and the claims of citizens to the enjoyment of rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed by the "fourteenth" Amendment might be denied by the "state agencies" 305 U.S. at 180 51 R 492, 81 Sct 473, id. 193. 51 R 492, 81 Sct 473 (HARLAN, J., concurring)... Also see*

*Williams v. Taylor (2000) 529 U.S. 362 [120 S.Ct. 1495, 140 L.ed.2d 389]  
 28 U.S.C. § 2254; PAKER V. CITY OF PLAINFIELD 9th CIR 2000) 205 F.3d 1138; MOORE V. CALDERON (9th CIR. 1997)*

*Release the Bond...*

*Marcia Civil Law*

CANTIL-SAKAUYE

Chief Justice